

THE
EXAMINER
EXAMINED:
OR, AN
H. Misopseudes.
ENQUIRY
INTO
Mr. DALLAS's
CONDUCT and MANNER
OF
WRITING.

—— totâ contabitur urbe.

*And the End of the Ungodly is, they shall be rooted
out at the last. Pſal. xxxvii. 39. New Version.*

NUMBER I.

DUBLIN:

Printed for JOHN WILSON, in *Trinity-Lane.*

(Price Two-Pence.)



T H E
E X A M I N E R
E X A M I N E D, &c.

THE clergy are a distinct body of men from the rest of the world with respect to their profession, and therefore they require distinct laws and rules to govern and direct them in the discharge of their duty.

And this has been the sense of the archbishops, bishops, and other men of station in the church, who, in the Year 1634, framed a certain number of rules, called canons, confirmed by the royal sanction which the clergy were required to observe, and certainly most of them are excellently framed for the good order and discipline of the church, and for the benefit of all the true members of it, and had they been carefully observed and put in force many advantages would have arisen to the church and state.

And that this was the intent of the Government and compilers of them, will appear from the following quotation, taken out of the royal sanction, prefixed to them in the *Book of Common-Prayer*;—straitly charging and commanding all archbishops, bishops, and all other that

exercise any ecclesiastical jurisdiction within this realm, every man in his place to see and procure (so much as in them lieth) all and every of the same canons, orders, ordinances and constitutions, to be in all points duly observed, not sparing to execute the penalties in them severally mentioned, upon any that shall wittingly, or willfully, break or neglect to observe the same, as they tender the honour of God, the peace of the church, tranquility of the kingdom, and their duties and service unto us their king and sovereign"—This is very express and full---and the reason of these canons is evident and still subsists---and while the reason subsists, should not the canons stand in full force---the honour of God, the peace of the church, and tranquility of the kingdom are still to be regarded—It is said by Mr. *Dallas*, that these canons are obsolete—I hope he subscribed to the first four, they surely are not obsolete, nor are many of the rest in the judgment of the best divines; and if they are not, does his saying, that the fifty-second is obsolete render it so? I hope not.

There are many acts of parliament, which tho' not so strictly observed, nor always put in execution are yet not obsolete. The act of parliament which says that a Papist shall not be possessed of a horse of a certain value is seldom put in force, and yet it may, and actually has been executed not many years ago in a neighbouring county—because then there was a necessity for the execution of it. I might instance in more acts, but the thing is too obvious to be insisted on.

Now

Now from this I would infer, that tho' some of the canons have been disused, yet when there is an absolute necessity, they ought to be observed, and the penalty they impose executed upon any that shall wittingly, or wilfully, break or neglect to observe them.

'Tis true a disuse of some of them, and especially of the fifty-second, has crept in by degrees in some dioceses, tho' in others this canon has been strictly observed, and particularly in *Raphoe*, in Dr. *Forster's* time.

In the diocese of *Corke* the practice has been, for some time past, to marry in private houses, and the present bishop, when he was a parish minister, observed the practice too, tho' perhaps, at the same time he disliked it; but it would have been impertinent and silly in him, however well-inclined to it, to have attempted an alteration; but when he was made bishop of *Corke*, what perhaps he wished to have seen observed in his private capacity he now recommends to the clergy in visitation, who all approved, consented and agreed to it, as very decent and proper to be done.

For if it was not proper to be done, why did the clergy consent to it; why did not they declare their dislike of it; and particularly, why did not Mr. *Dallas* exert himself then, to hinder the observation of this obsolete canon? It does not appear that the least objection was made to the revival of it. And I am convinced from this silence, that many of the clergy were glad to see that antient, useful custom revived and restored; so I think the bishop should not claim the sole merit

merit of reviving this usage, the clergy certainly are intitled to their share of it.

And this usage, by what I find, was punctually observed, to the great honour of the clergy of the diocese, for two or more years, and established into a custom, and I have often heard the bishop and clergy justly commended for it.

But this wholesome usage, happily established by the consent of the clergy, was broke through, and the good consequences expected to arise from it audaciously defeated, by a man, who had not the least right to officiate in the smallest matters in the diocese, much less to meddle in affairs of the highest moment, *viz.* the solemnization of marriages; by a man who had been admonished by the bishop, for perhaps very good reasons, not to exercise any ministerial office in the diocese; by a man, who, if public fame be true, might have behaved better in every station of life he was in. And I wish, for the sake of his gown, that he had not given the world so much reason as he has done to have an unfavourable opinion of him.

In one of his letters, signed *Philadelphicus*, he expressly charges the bishop with having excited an unchristian opposition and shameful contradiction of the clergy to one another, to the grief of all honest men and good Protestants; and who, to the joy of our enemies, endeavour to rend the church, and to set clergymen by the ears together---But what a black, groundless calumny is this, as black as he, the author of it.

Is it not Mr. *Dallas* does all this? Has not he raised and fomented divisions, and seems to take a pleasure in endeavouring to set the clergy by the
the

the ears, by his irregularities, and to raise a spirit of unchristian opposition between them and their bishop, that he may fish some gain to himself in their troubled waters, and raise commiseration in weak or mistaken minds---his begging letters sufficiently attest this, some of which I have seen. Did he not act in open defiance of all duty and canonical obedience? did not he openly deny the bishop's jurisdiction, as appears by his own writings, and then descend to the poor shift of saying, his lawyers desired him to say so?

And to throw dust in the eyes of the undiscerning, he begins to libel and abuse the bishop, as if he had tempted him to misbehave; and he justifies his own innocence, by saying, he transgressed no law, or but one of human appointment.---What opinion must the world have of such a man?

The most wicked being in the world, is, by way of emphasis, called, the *Calumniator*, whose chief delight and employment is, to tempt, and then to misrepresent and traduce mortals.

Pray, If a common soldier, or inferior officer in the army, disobeys the lawful orders of his superiors, what is the consequence? Is he not justly punished? If a layman transgresses the civil laws openly, and acts in defiance of them, he is made to submit, and suffer the penalty of them. Have not all orders and societies of men, rules to direct and restrain them?---And the reason is plain, that all men might see their duty before hand, and know the penalties of transgressing them. Will the clergy alone plead an exemption?---The clergy, who should lead exemplary lives,

lives, and let their light shine before men.---'Tis objected that degradation is not adequate to the crime---Can the bishop help that? Is not that the penalty of the canon? and did not Mr. *Dallas* know this, and yet, wilfully transgressed it?

In the transgression of the civil laws, if a man steals but a sheep, he will be hanged. In the transgression of the military or admiralty laws, the punishments are extremely severe, and the highest officers have been cashiered---and it is necessary it should be so, on account of the ill consequences that might attend disobedience. In the violation of the College statutes, I am told, that a scholar will be expelled for breaking a lamp, &c. and fellows, and even the best men's sons in the kingdom suffer the penalties of the statutes; yet few people think these punishments too great, because they know them and ought to avoid them. And however severe Mr. *Dallas's* punishment may seem to some, yet I have heard great numbers of worthy clergymen declare, that any clergyman, who behaved in the wilfull, insolent manner that Mr. *Dallas* did, deserved degradation, because a crime wilfully committed by a clergyman carries in it greater depravity of mind, and a higher degree of malignity, than the same does when committed by a layman.

And, indeed, I think it appears demonstrably evident, that Mr. *Dallas*, in his own breast, must be self-condemned, because the nature of the understanding is such, that it must assent to truth, for if it could assent to falsehood, it would be inevitably led into error, and God might be charged with its consequences, which is impious to suppose. The understanding cannot but admit, that
the

the whole is greater than a part, that black is not white---and if these propositions are of such a nature as require the understanding to pass a judgment on them, to pronounce them either good or bad according to their conformity or disagreement to a rule, the understanding then changes its name and is called conscience. Now let us apply this. Mr. *Dallas* knew that there was a rule made, in the diocese of *Corke*, to observe the fifty-second canon, and that the clergy promised to observe it, and actually did observe it; if therefore he transgressed this rule, he must have been conscious to himself that he acted wrong in transgressing it, let him say what he will; it will therefore follow that he is self-convinced and self-condemned.

Besides, his applying to Mr. *Freeman* to speak to Mr. *Oliver*, for leave to marry him, evidently proves the wilfullness of the action; and his asking Dean *Mead*, at Sir *John Freke's*, if he would answer the consequences of his making a submission, demonstrates his consciousness of the obligation he was under to observe the rule; for, if he was not conscious of guilt, why should he dread the consequences---if it was an innocent, lawful action, where was the occasion for fear---but conscience, tho' stifled and seared will have bitter intervals; it will accuse, convict, condemn and punish.

Mr. *Dallas* complains, that the bishop would not reason with him, and convince him of his crime.

Pray, is that man to be reasoned with that thinks it no crime to break through the established rules of a diocese; nay, that defends it as allow-

able? Of what use or advantage are rules, laws, canons, or usages, if they have no force, but are all a dead letter? This, indeed, would make both them and the church ridiculous. Would it not then be lost labour to attempt to convince or reclaim the man who affirms, that no man is injured in his good name, property or person, by that man who invades the right of another, and who maintains that such an action is quite innocent. Does the officiously intruding into other men's business, without authority, injure no man? Does the transgressing laws, rules, or customs, injure no man? This is a new doctrine indeed, and we must swallow it down because Mr. *Dallas* asserts it is so.

He likewise has the modesty to say, that the better sort of people had for some scores of years married in private houses. Now, the contrary is evidently true. It is well known, that while Doctor *Forster* was bishop of *Raphoe*, scarce an instance can be given of any marriage solemnized in Church; nay, so strictly did he observe this rule, that he would not dispense with it, even to marry his own brother, the Lord Chief Justice, out of church; and this is not many score years since---and I think the Lord Chief Justice was one of the better sort---I could give more instances, and even at the present, the usage of marrying in church is in many places observed in the kingdom, and the good example set by the diocese of *Corke*, was applauded and followed in many places, as I am assured by men of veracity who have been eye-witnesses of it; and it is more than probable that this commendable usage would have continued many years unbroke thro' had

had not this disturber unfortunately come into the diocese; for the beneficed clergy and curates of the diocese punctually observed it.

And I appeal to Mr. *Dallas* himself, if it is not an established custom among all the protestant clergy of the kingdom, that no clergyman ever does baptize, or marry, out of his own parish, or where he has no right, without either express or tacit leave of the clergyman where he is desired by the laity to do any duty; because, this would be officiously intruding into other men's business, which, I believe, is rarely done among any set or society of men.

An officer in the army never does the duty of another without being desired---A lawyer never appears for another lawyer's client of himself; or, when does a physician visit the patient of another physician without being sent for----- There are certain decencies and decorums to be observed by them all, which gentlemen, and men of honour and reputation, scrupulously observe. I don't remember of a single instance, except this of Mr. *Dallas's*, of any clergyman's desiring, or pressing, to do any duty in a parish where there was even a hint that it would be disagreeable, much less where he was forbid, or desired not to do it. And the reason is plain, because they are gentlemen who know their duty, and have a regard for their reputation.

This gentleman also seems to have grossly misrepresented the nature of christian charity and mercy, and wrests their meaning to serve his own purpose

It is true, the general scope of the Scriptures recommend and enforce universal benevolence, nor is there any one virtue in them so strongly insisted

on, as a merciful temper---They abound with instances ; but this extends to men as men and as christians ; as men who are all equally the workmanship of God, who should love one another, and desire to do all the good to others in their power.

But does the Scripture any where say, that the exercise of this virtue supercedes the execution of public justice ; that it dispences with known and established laws and rules, either divine, civil, or ecclesiastical ; that magistrates shall not inflict punishments on transgressors , that persons intrusted with the execution of laws, and with a superintending power, shall connive at offences, and thereby encourage vice. Is not God just as well as merciful ; just in punishing, as merciful in forgiving ; just in punishing to the third and fourth generation, and merciful in forgiving thousands that obey his commands. And I will venture to affirm, from the bishop's known humanity, that he did not hate, or persecute the man, but only punished the willful offender.

The bishop is represented by him as a proud, over-bearing man---But the best and only way to judge of the moral character of a man, is to observe the general tenor of his actions, and his conduct, in all the relations he stands with regard to the rest of mankind. Now, examine the bishop's conduct as a bishop ; as a husband ; as a father ; as a brother ; as a Friend ; and it will appear that he acts properly and from principle in all these. One of the first men in the kingdom, and distinguished for his probity, gave a sufficient proof of his knowledge and approbation of his principles and morals.

Let

Let only his actions, as a bishop, be inquired into, and the more they are inquired into, the more will envy and calumny be silenced and put to shame.

Does he not generously dispose of his livings, as they become vacant, to the old curates of his diocese; to men of worth, who have been neglected by late bishops---He has established a noble fund for the support of the widows of deceased clergymen, now imitated by other diocesses; he recommends it to all his clergy to catechise the children of their respective parishes, and he punctually fees himself, by examining them, that they are instructed in the principles of the Christian Religion at confirmation: Is this the character of a proud, over-bearing man? And as to his charity, all his neighbours may see what vast sums he has spent in improvements purely to employ poor labourers.

And it is every-where spoke of to his honour, that he will not suddenly ordain young men, till they have given some proof of their sobriety, and other qualifications.

It would reflect great honour on the priesthood if this was universally observed. How many young, unthinking men are ordained before they have fully considered the nature and dignity of that holy order. Instances may be given of young men who have done great dishonour to the gown, to the bishops that ordain them, and to the Christian Religion.

I am surprized to find, that Mr. *Dallas*, in his writings, endeavours to brand the bishop with cruelty, and other hard names, because he will
not

not admit idle, unemployed clergymen into his diocese.

The canons have wisely provided, that no man shall be ordained without a nomination to a cure. Had this canon been observed, much reproach and scandal would have escaped the clergy; for it generally happens, that men not employed have brought scandal on that order of men, because when they have nothing to do, and are of low fortunes, they too often become meer lick-spittles, and to oblige men in power, from whom they expect favours, prostitute their holy office.

But Mr. *Dallas* has got such a habit of dictating to his boys, that I verily believe he thinks all the world boys, or old women: Let him say, or write what he will, he thinks to ram it down our throats for truth. Had he been a regular, good clergyman he would have advised Mr. *Oliver* and his lady to be married in church, and to conform to the usage of the diocese, to have shewn a good example to others, as he was a man of figure, and I dare say they would have been advised. This would have reflected honour on him, and might have taken off any ill impression which his former conduct had made on people's minds; but this would not answer his purpose, he seems to have been resolved to lay hold on this opportunity to asperse the bishop, but for what end he knows best himself.

The Lord O——y, patron of *Charleville-school*, turned him out of the school; yet I never heard any man blame his lordship for it, and even Mr. *Dallas* submitted, and never drew his pen against him;

him ; he lost a cure in the diocese of *Cloyne*, yet no one was censured for his losing it. The bishop of *Corke* takes notice of his offences and irregularities, he is the most cruel man in the world, without bowels, without mercy and charity ; nay, his very relations, men of the most unexceptionable characters must be aspersed too, and charged with giving false testimony ; and why ? because the bishop does his duty, and acts agreeable to his station and supports his jurisdiction ; and because he will not dispense with canons, established rules, and even with the obligation of his conscience to humour Mr. *Dallas*, and save a lady's virgin blushes.

'Tis true, the best of men may do wrong things through mistake or frailty : we have all our unguarded moments, *humanum est errare*, but it is our duty to acknowledge our faults, be sorry for them, and give some satisfaction to the laws which we have violated ; *he that covereth his sins shall not prosper, but whose confesseth and forsaketh them shall have mercy*, says the wisest of men.

But it seems it would be a heinous crime for a gentleman, (as Mr. *Dallas* calls himself) for a scholar, for a man of birth, and allied to the best families of *Corke*, to confess his crimes and repent of them : This would expose him and do dishonour to the gown---fine reasoning ! A fine gentleman, and a fine school-master indeed ! What notions of virtue, duty, or obedience, will this man instill into the tender minds of his scholars ? who avows it base to confess a crime, when he should whip a boy for concealing one.

Keep

Keep such a man private, conceal him from being discovered, or give him Gyges's ring, what will he stick at ; ask him if he committed such a crime, or married any one, *not he ; God forbid ; prove it fir.*

Is such a man a fit light to shine before men ? Can such a man be called the salt of the earth to season men with virtue, and keep them from corruption, and to turn them from disobedience, to observe the rules of decency, order, morality and christianity, I appeal to the public, let them judge.

Misopseudes.

[To be continued.]

6- DEC 58

